

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
8

9 SHARON KATHRYN BECK,

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

12 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

13 Respondents.  
14

Case No. 3:19-cv-00092-LRH-WGC

**ORDER**

15 In this closed action, Kathryn Sharon Mattos has filed an application to proceed in forma  
16 pauperis (ECF No. 10) and a motion for leave to amend (ECF No. 11). The court denies both  
17 motions.

18 The court dismissed this action for two reasons. First, this court was not the correct  
19 venue. Sharon Kathryn Beck, the putative petitioner, and all the respondents are in either  
20 Riverside County or San Bernardino County, California. Second, this court, and any federal  
21 court, needed to abstain from interfering in the ongoing proceedings the California state courts.  
22 The court also noted that it was questionable whether Mattos could file a petition on Beck's  
23 behalf, but the court did not decide that question. ECF No. 6, at 1-3.

24 Mattos asks for leave to amend to correct the errors of the original petition, but the court is  
25 not persuaded. Mattos cannot correct the defects noted above by amending the petition. Mattos  
26 simply is in the wrong court.


27 ///

28 ///

1 IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that the application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF  
2 No. 10) is **DENIED**.

3 IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that the motion for leave to amend (ECF No. 11) is  
4 **DENIED**.

5 DATED this 9th day of May, 2019.

6   
7 LARRY R. HICKS  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28